



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,839	07/25/2003	Ji-hyun In	Q76648	9261
23373 7590 07/25/2008 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER BRADLEY, MATTHEW A	
			ART UNIT 2187	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/626,839

Applicant(s)

IN ET AL.

Examiner

MATTHEW BRADLEY

Art Unit

2187

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☒ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-10 is/are allowed.
6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action has been issued in response to amendment filed 18 April 2008. Applicant's arguments have been carefully and fully considered and are persuasive.

Examiner's Note

This application is in condition for allowance except for the presence of the objections noted *infra* and withdrawn claims 11-22 directed to the invention non-elected without traverse in the reply filed on 17 November 2005. Accordingly, in the complete reply to this office action, please cancel claims 11-22. See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Status

Claims 1-10 remain pending and are ready for examination.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure

sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Accordingly, the abstract is objected to for repeating information given in the title.

Further, the Applicant is encouraged to amend the title of the invention such that it is descriptive of the invention as claimed, as required by sec. 606.01 of the MPEP.

Furthermore, the Examiner suggests that the abstract should be amended to bring the abstract into harmony with the allowed claims as required by paragraph 2 of sec. 1302.01 of the MPEP.

Furthermore, the Examiner suggests that the summary of invention should be amended to bring the summary into harmony with the allowed claims as required by paragraph 2 of sec. 1302.01 of the MPEP.

Claim Objections

Claims 5 and 6 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 5, line 9 – the phrase 'to be requested to write' appears. For increased clarity, the Examiner suggests changing the phrase to 'to be requested to be written.'

- Claim 5, lines 11-12 - the phrase 'to be requested to write' appears twice. For increased clarity, the Examiner suggests changing the phrase to 'to be requested to be written.'
- Claim 5, lines 15-16 - the phrase 'to be requested to write' appears twice. For increased clarity, the Examiner suggests changing the phrase to 'to be requested to be written.'
- Claim 5, lines 17-18 - the phrase 'to be requested to write' appears. For increased clarity, the Examiner suggests changing the phrase to 'to be requested to be written.'
- Claim 6, line 9 – the phrase 'to be requested to read' appears. For increased clarity, the Examiner suggests changing the phrase to 'to be requested to be read.'
- Claim 6, lines 11-12 - the phrase 'to be requested to read' appears twice. For increased clarity, the Examiner suggests changing the phrase to 'to be requested to be read.'
- Claim 6, lines 14-15 - the phrase 'to be requested to read' appears twice. For increased clarity, the Examiner suggests changing the phrase to 'to be requested to be read.'

Appropriate correction is required.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-10 are allowed.

The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art made of record teaches a flash memory management method, but fails to teach the combination including the limitation of:

(Claim 1) "...wherein, if the mapping information on the data block exists in the mapping area, data is read from the data block in the alternative area, and if the mapping information on the data block does not exist in the mapping area, data is read from the data block at the original address in the data area.";

(Claim 5) "...wherein, if the mapping information on the data block exists in the mapping area, data is read from the data block in the alternative area, and if the mapping information on the data block does not exist in the mapping area, data is read from the data block at the original address in the data area.";

(Claim 6) "...wherein, if the mapping information on the data block exists in the mapping area, data is read from the data block in the alternative area, and if the mapping information on the data block does not exist in the mapping area, data is read from the data block at the original address in the data area.";

(Claim 7) "... wherein, if the mapping information on the data block exists in the mapping area, data is read from the data block in the alternative area, and if the mapping information on the data block does not exist in the mapping area, data is read from the data block at the original address in the data area."

As dependent claims **2-4, 8-9, and 10**, depend from an allowable base claim; they are at least allowable for the same reasons as noted supra.

The prior art made of record, neither anticipates nor renders obvious the above-recited combinations for at least the reasons specified and as shown in Applicant's Arguments filed 9 January 2008.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9 January 2008 have been carefully and fully considered, and are persuasive.

Conclusion

This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters as noted supra.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213, (Comm'r Pat. 1935).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew Bradley whose telephone number is (571) 272-8575. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Ellis can be reached on (571) 272-4205. The fax

Art Unit: 2187

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KLE/mb

/Kevin L Ellis/
Acting SPE of Art Unit 2187